

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 30 2006

F A X

311 Castle Hayne Drive
Cary, NC 27519

To: USPTO (Business Fax)
Fax number: (571) 273-8300

From: Igor V. Touzov (#34185)
Fax number:
Business phone:
Home phone:

Date & Time: 5/30/2006 12:39:23 PM
Pages: 5
Re: Reference 10/605,516

To: Hoa Q. Pham
Art Unit 2877

Application: 10/605,516

Igor Touzov

Page 1 of 4

Dear Hoa Pham,

The grounds for your requirement of election arise from peculiar wording of original claims, while the species of the invention are not patentably distinct. In fact all original claims describe operation of single feedback loop that controls sophisticated apparatus. The four groups do not represent four distinct invention species but rather different subcomponents of single specie.

It is well known that common feedback loop accounts for sensors and actuators. The group I emphasizes on sensory subcomponent while the groups II-IV on actuator subcomponent. It is important to notice that controlling method for plurality of cantilever type devices can not be different from deformation. That is why Group II and III are essentially the same species as process of creation of "**controlled deformations**" is synonym to "**controlling operation**". On other hand, it is well known that cantilever "**oscillation**" is one of the modes of "**controlled deformations**" of cantilevers. In public literature such modes are referred as TM (Tapping Mode), FM (Force Modulation), LF (Lateral Force), etc.

Based on these I appeal to consider this invention without restrictions. In case this petition is declined I elect group I with traverse.

Below are amended claims that modified to dependent form and shall allow consideration without restriction requirement.

Regards,
Igor Touzov